

# Advisory Team: Accountability Task Force

## MINUTES

MAY 26, 2016

1:00PM-4:00PM

OFFICE OF THE NH DEPARTMENT OF  
EDUCATION

ADVISORY TEAM LEADS	Scott Mantie and Sandra MacDonald, NH DOE
CONSULTANTS	Scott Marion and Juan D'Brot, Center for Assessment
NOTE TAKER	Juan D'Brot, Center for Assessment
ATTENDEES	
OBSERVERS	
PRE-READ MATERIALS	<a href="#">ESSA Accountability Rules Summary</a> ; Activity #1:

DISCUSSION	
<b>OBJECTIVES FOR MEETING:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Review high-level theory of action.</li> <li>2. Unpacking the continuous improvement process.</li> <li>3. Review the current draft ESSA regulation summary to inform accountability system constraints.</li> </ol>	
<b>1:00</b>	<b>Welcome and review agenda</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Scott Marion, Center for Assessment and Scott Mantie, NH DOE</li> </ul> <p><u>Discussion:</u> Scott Marion and Scott Mantie welcomed the task force briefly reviewed the agenda. Scott Marion noted that there would be a revision to the agenda due to the recent release of the ESSA draft regulations and that the task force would spend some time closely reading the proposed regulations and react to them. The activities that were planned for this meeting were designed to further flesh out the state's theory of action and set the foundation for the types of indicators that should be included in an accountability system.</p>
<b>1:15</b>	<b>Reviewing a Draft Theory of Action for the NH ESSA Accountability System</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Scott Marion, Center for Assessment and Scott Mantie, NH DOE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Based on the information and insights generated at the last meeting, the Center drafted a high-level theory of action to guide the task force's work. However, the theory of action was kept intentionally high-level.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><u>Discussion:</u> Dr. Scott Marion provided a brief presentation to the task force regarding the high-level theory of action. During this portion of the meeting, Dr. Marion described how the task force's previous conversations have informed the following major components of the theory of action:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The accountability system presents useful information on high-leverage indicators of school effectiveness</li> <li>2. Effective use of data and school quality indicators</li> <li>3. High-quality leadership and professional school culture</li> <li>4. Effective and differentiated instruction</li> <li>5. Students are prepared for meaningful postsecondary outcomes</li> </ol> <p>After unpacking student outcomes (through core academic knowledge and skills, cross-cutting skills, and work-study practices), Dr. Marion presented some of the task force's previous ideas regarding student outcomes and framed how there must be a consideration of effective data use by supporting teachers and leaders. This conversation was also framed as a way to compare ideas of how an accountability system might support this theory of action compared to what limitations may emerge as a result of the proposed regulations on ESSA (next topic).</p>
<b>1:45</b>	<b>Close Reading of the ESSA Proposed Regulations Summary</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Scott Marion, Center for Assessment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Task force members were provided links to the proposed ESSA regulations</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>This activity took place before the originally planned activity on how task force members use data to participate in school improvement activities. For this activity, Dr. Marion asked the task force members to first work independently by engaging in a close reading activity of the ESSA proposed regulations summary provided by Ed Week (the proposed regulations are quite lengthy and the summary provided a good overview of the major portions of the proposed regulations). Once they completed their close reads, task force members would briefly discuss what they identified as points of interest, concern, or importance. Dr. Marion would then facilitate whole-group discussion of the issues and provide any relevant thoughts or feedback to the group.</p>

This process was intended to help task force members better understand the potential constraints they could be facing when making recommendations around how the accountability system should be designed.

During the first part of the activity, task force members spent approximately 30 minutes reviewing the summary, taking notes, and engaging in small group conversation over various aspects of the regulations. Once task force members completed their review, Dr. Marion began by asking for general reactions from the task force. The task force members generally fell in one of two groups of perspectives. These included those that believed the proposed regulations reflected a restatement of *No Child Left Behind* and those who believed that it provided schools and districts the opportunity to use additional data to demonstrate performance. This disagreement was further reflected by comments contrasting the requirement to rank with the ranking in which stakeholders inherently engaged under the old iteration of the law. Further discussion and clarification revolved around the idea of a single accountability system, the need for comparability across schools and districts, creating a system that both incentivizes the right kinds of behaviors but makes sense to the public, and how to ensure that school and district ratings appropriately reflect both outcomes and progress on improvement plans.

## 2:45 How do schools improve? What data are necessary and useful?

- ✓ Scott Marion and Juan D'Brot, Center for Assessment
  - Activity #1 handout

For this activity, Dr. Scott Marion asked task force members to divide into groups of at least 3 people based on how they were seated. Each group's task was to identify a significant local educational problem and describe the types of data and how those data are used to help inform decisions, practice, and responses. Groups spent approximately 30 minutes engaging in discussion by first identifying a common local educational problem around which the group could describe data that were used to inform interventions. Drs. Marion and D'Brot circulated the room and listened to individual groups to provide ideas, feedback, and probes to further the conversation. The description of the problem transitioned into thinking about the data. Task force members thought about the kinds of data that were used, whether data went beyond traditional achievement data, and how those data were used in groups. Finally, groups discussed the types of actions and behaviors that were informed by the data and how interventions were evaluated.

The next 15 minutes were spent sharing perspectives around three key ideas: what types of problems did people discuss, what value was placed on state-level data, and how did people react to data sources that may be communicating conflicting messages. Task force members predominantly described how they used attendance and discipline data when using non-academic indicators, and how they used a combination of growth and achievement when considering academic indicators. Furthermore, there was some interest in considering outside accountability, as in using additional information that was not provided by the state (e.g., IB, NEASC). While task force members reflected that data at the state level were valuable, there needed to be an awareness of where those data originated. Finally, task force members described the need for multiple data sources to confirm information. For example, corroborating state-level data with local data. Other task force members put a finer point on this as fleshing out the story the state-level data communicate to paint a more holistic picture. From that picture, then instructional decisions can more aptly be made.

## 3:30 Evolving toward a Framework

- ✓ Scott Mantie, NH DOE and Scott Marion, Center for Assessment

The final portion of the agenda focused on a presentation by Dr. Scott Mantie on Evolving toward a Framework. Dr. Mantie reflected on the benefits of using an adaptable framework that culls information from data in order to better support decisions. The discussion systematically described how a framework builds on available data to support an examination of multiple measures that are available in a system. By leveraging a set of processes that help stakeholders make inferences, a strong framework can help stakeholders triangulate to paint an accurate picture of performance. Further, the components relevant to ESSA accountability systems can be leveraged for federal and state purposes while maintaining an alignment with local efforts. Task force members believed that maintaining this kind of alignment throughout the development of an accountability system and identifying the processes and tools that can be best leveraged by schools should make the accountability system more useful and relevant to school improvement and student learning efforts.

## 3:55 Next steps and next meetings

- ✓ May 26: 1:00-4:00 PM
- ✓ June 10: 9:00-Noon
- ✓ More meetings TBA

## Noon Adjourn

### CONCLUSIONS

Thank you for the valuable participation and input from the task force members. We will work before the next meeting to provide you with a more detailed theory of action and potentially some considerations for accountability indicators. As with this meeting, any relevant pre-reading materials will be sent in advance.

### ACTION ITEMS

### PERSON RESPONSIBLE

### DEADLINE

Draft a more detailed theory of action & consider potential system designs

Center for Assessment

June 10